

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 7-11, 13, 14, and 22-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 8 and 22 are written in independent form. Claims 19 and 20 have been cancelled by this Amendment. By this Amendment, Applicant has added new claims 22-24, which Applicant respectfully submits are allowable over the cited art of record for reasons similar to those discussed below with respect to claims 1, 2, 7-11, 13 and 14.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) – Rozak

Claims 1-2 and 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rozak. Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

Rozak is directed to a method and system for displaying a variable number of alternative words during speech recognition. Rozak is directed to allowing a user using a word processor (e.g., Microsoft Word) on a personal computer (PC) with speech recognition software to be prompted with a window with likely alternatives to a misrecognized word. The user selects one of the prompted alternatives and, if there is time to train, the recognizer is adjusted in step 904 such that it thereafter associates the misrecognized speech with word indicated by the user prompt selection.

The present invention is related generally to voice **command** recognition, and not merely speech recognition as disclosed by Rozak. Independent claim 1 recites “dynamically modifying the stored recognition vocabulary … wherein said dynamic modifying includes enabling the user to create a **replacement command word**” (Emphasis added). As discussed above, Rozak is directed to a generic speech recognition program and is silent regarding command words of any type. The speech text which is recognized in Rozak is simply word processing text, and not commands.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Rozak. As such, claims 2 and 6-7, dependent upon independent claim 1, are likewise allowable over Rozak for at least the reasons given above with respect to independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Hedin in view of Rozak

Claims 8-11, 14 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedin in view of Rozak. Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

Examiner admits deficiencies in Hedin

Hedin is directed to a voice control interface to service applications. Hedin discloses a remote server which is connected to a plurality of local terminals. The local terminals include a relatively weak speech recognition system (ASR). If the local terminal is unable to recognize a user's spoken utterance, the local terminal forwards the unrecognized sound portion to the remote server for higher powered speech recognition processing (see Step 419 of FIG. 4). If the remote server is also unable to recognize the transferred unrecognized sound portion, the local terminal is instructed to prompt the user to repeat the previous sound entry.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner in that

Hedin et al. fails to specifically disclose the step of dynamically modifying the stored recognition vocabulary based on said comparison to approve recognition accuracy for a subsequently received utterance, wherein said dynamically modifying includes enabling the user to create a replacement command word that is stored in the stored recognition vocabulary as a replacement command word corresponding to the received utterance, where the user's utterance was not recognized due to the user's accent or other user-specific speech feature.

(see pages 5-6 of the Office Action)

The Examiner asserts that Rozak compensates for the Examiner acknowledged deficiency of Hedin. However, as discussed above, Rozak is directed exclusively to speech recognition in a word processing environment, and teaches nothing related to command words.

Rozak related to generic speech recognition, not command words

Further, Rozak is directed to speech recognition performed on a personal computer (PC). The claim recites a client device and a server in communication with each other, which is not the same as a mere microphone interface on a PC running Microsoft Word. Accordingly, given the Examiner's acknowledged deficiencies of the teaching of Hedin, and the above description of the shared deficiencies of Rozak, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Hedin and Rozak cannot disclose or suggest "a server in communication with the client device ... and dynamically modifying the stored recognition vocabulary ... wherein the client device enables the user to create a replacement command word that is stored in the stored recognition vocabulary as a replacement command word corresponding to the received utterance" as recited in independent claim 8.

Combination of Hedin and Rozak would not result in claimed invention

Further, Hedin is directed to lower-powered local terminals performing primitive speech recognition in connection with higher-powered servers performing more advanced speech recognition. In combining Hedin with Rozak, it is not clear whether the teachings of Rozak are intended to compensate for the speech recognition deficiencies of Hedin at the local terminals or at the server. The computer requirements of the speech recognition software disclosed in Rozak with a word processing speech software program are typically performed on a desktop or

notebook computer, and not the lower-powered local terminals disclosed by Hedin (e.g., which are described in Hedin as simply being mobile phones). The mobile phones of Hedin do not perform substantive speech recognition, but simply perform rudimentary speech recognition and relay misrecognized sound portions back to a server or base station. Accordingly, it is not likely that the advanced speech recognition of Rozak would be included within the local terminals, upon which the examiner is reading the claimed “client device”. However, the “dynamically modifying” step is claimed as being performed at the client device, and not the server. Accordingly, it is not clear how the combination of Hedin and Rozak, either alone or in combination, can disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter.

As such, claims 9-11 and 14, dependent upon independent claim 8, are likewise allowable over Hedin and Rozak for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 8.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Hedin in view of Rozak and further in view of Kenevsky

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedin in view of Rozak and further in view of Kenevsky. Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

A cursory review of Kenevsky reveals that Kenevsky is insufficient to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Hedin and Rozak in disclosing or suggesting the features recited in independent claim 8. As such, claim 13, dependent upon independent claim 8, is likewise allowable over the combination of Hedin in view of Rozak and further in view of Kenevsky for at least the reasons given above with respect to independent claim 8.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1, 2, 7-11, 13, 14, and 22-24 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/MJL/DAP:psy